

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 416

SP 016 047

AUTHOR Dansker, Judith  
TITLE A Conference on Planning for Documentation and the National Conference Follow-up Program (Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, February 1979).  
INSTITUTION Southeastern Teacher Corps Network, Atlanta, Ga.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.  
PUB DATE Aug 79  
NOTE 46p.  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Accountability; \*Data Collection; \*Documentation; \*Educational Research; \*Planning; Research Utilization; \*Skill Development; Validated Programs  
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Corps

## ABSTRACT

This document reports on the activities of the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network's 1979 conference on planning for the documentation and follow-up survey of educational conferences. Topics discussed at the meeting include developing the skills and operational procedures for documentation processes in Network organizations, and developing the ability to gather educational research data for later use in Teacher Corps conferences and programs. A list of conference participants is appended. (LH)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED186416

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

A CONFERENCE ON  
PLANNING FOR DOCUMENTATION  
AND  
THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

February, 1979  
The Myrtle Beach Hilton  
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

MAY 16 1980

SP 016047

**SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK**

**Conference Report**

**Prepared by**

**Judith Dansker**

**Produced by**

**SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

**August, 1979**

**Burnett Joiner, Executive Secretary**

**Charlene Patrick, Administrative Assistant  
for Office Operations**

**Judith Dansker, Administrative Assistant for  
Documentation and Evaluation**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                    | Page |
|------------------------------------|------|
| TABLES                             | i    |
| I. INTRODUCTION                    | 1    |
| II. CONFERENCE EVALUATION          | 5    |
| III. IMPLICATIONS                  | 14   |
| APPENDICES                         |      |
| A. Conference Program              | 20   |
| B. Conference Evaluation Form      | 24   |
| C. Network Board of Directors      | 29   |
| D. Council of Deans                | 31   |
| E. Teacher Corps Washington        |      |
| Staff Contact Persons              | 33   |
| F. Task Force Planning Team        | 35   |
| G. List of Conference Participants | 37   |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Number</u> |                                                                              | <u>Page</u> |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1             | Ratings of Participants on Program Objectives                                | 5           |
| 2             | Ratings of Participants on Conference Relevancy/<br>Effectiveness (general)  | 7           |
| 3             | Ratings of Participants on Conference Relevancy/<br>Effectiveness (specific) | 8           |
| 4             | Ratings of Participants on Resources                                         | 10          |
| 5             | Ratings of Participants on Personal Experience                               | 11          |
| 6             | Ratings of Participants on Summary Ranking                                   | 14          |

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Southeastern Teacher Corps Network is a regional organization of Teacher Corps projects which are located in the states of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, and South Carolina. These projects represent cooperative educational efforts between twenty colleges and universities and fourteen local school districts (and their communities) designed to: (1) improve the educational opportunities available to children in areas where there are concentrations of low-income families; (2) encourage colleges and universities to broaden their teacher education programs; and (3) encourage higher education institutions and school districts to improve the quality of training and staff development activities offered to teachers, paraprofessionals, and other personnel. The Southeastern Teacher Corps Network was established by Teacher Corps Washington to serve as a support system and to provide needs-responsive assistance to local Teacher Corps projects in achieving their project objectives.

The director of each of the fourteen local Teacher Corps projects and the dean of the school or college of education for each of the participating institutions of higher education, comprise the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network Board of Directors and Council of Deans. These two groups provide operational direction to the Network in responding to the developmental and programmatic needs of local projects. All directors and deans serve with equal authority to establish policy, plan specific activities, and approve the use of funds assigned

directly to the Network to support mutually agreed to inter-project activities. The policies and decisions made by the Network Board of Directors and Council of Deans are subject to operational rules, regulations, and policies issued by the coordinating funding agent, Atlanta University, and Teacher Corps Washington.

From February 12-15, 1979 the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network sponsored a conference in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina titled "A Conference on Planning for Documentation and the National Conference Follow-Up Program."

When the conference was in the planning stages, the Board of Directors decided to combine both programs at the same conference to save time and expense. The conference opened with Planning for Documentation and closed with the National Conference Follow-Up Program.

Forty-six (46) participants attended the conference with approximately three (3) people from each of the fourteen (14) projects.

The objectives of the conference focused on Documentation and were intended to assist participants in:

--Developing skill in planning for documentation

- Experiencing the documentation process;
- Developing two specific documentation skills;
- Developing skill in reducing and utilizing documentation data; and
- Responding to the issues of reliability, validity, confidentiality, access and data-utilization

The Task Force Planning Team included Dr. Suzanne Kinzer, Dr. Edith Miller, Dr. Marcy Szymanski, and Dr. Burnett Joiner.

The workshop on Planning for Documentation convened with the general sessions listed below:

- Team Planning for Documentation (Simulation and Reality)
- Experience in Data-Gathering

and continued with these concurrent skill sessions:

- Recordkeeping
- Media
- Psychometric A
- Psychometric B
- Anthropological
- Sociometric

Each session was repeated twice. The National Conference Follow-Up Program presented concurrent strand sessions; however, they were not repeated. They included:

- Planning
- Institutionalization of Change
- Documentation
- Twelve Cycle Projects-  
Planning for "close out"

The presenters and facilitators included Roberta Hughey, Suzanne Kinzer, Kristy Wray, Edith Miller, Ron Wright, Robert Soar, Ron Springer, Mike Littleford, Charles Greenshields, Johnnie Mills, Walt Le Baron, Bruce Dollar, Roger Pankratz and Ann Wheeler. The conference program appears in Appendix A.

As part of network documentation, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form at the final session. There were a total of thirty-eight (38) items: thirty (30) items requested a rating on a five-point scale, six (6) items requested a rating on a five-point scale and asked for recommendations, and two (2) items were open-ended. The questionnaire was divided into the following areas:

- Objectives
- Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (general)
- Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (specific)
- Resources
- Personal Experience
- Summary Ranking and Recommendations

The two final questions did not fall into the categories listed above. One question asked participants what issues or topics they would like to have covered in a conference on the same topic. The other question asked what topics they would like to have covered in a Network Conference on a different topic. A copy of the evaluation form appears in Appendix B.

## II. CONFERENCE EVALUATION

At the conclusion of the conference twenty-seven (27) evaluations were submitted. The response rate was fifty-seven percent (57%). A summary and analysis of participants' reactions follow.

### Conference Objectives

Items 1 through 5 in section A stated each conference objective and asked to what degree they were met. Items 6 and 7 asked whether the objectives were clearly stated and realizable. The scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being the most negative indicator and 5 being the most positive indicator. Table 1 contains the ratings of participants in regard to the conference objectives.

TABLE 1  
Conference Objectives Ratings

| OBJECTIVES                                                                                                                            | -1     | 2      | 3      | 4       | 5 +    | MEAN |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|------|
| 1. Developed skill in planning for documentation that is responsive to program objectives, underlying theory and unexpected outcomes. | 0      | 0      | 8(32%) | 8(32%)  | 9(36%) | 4.0  |
| 2. Experienced the documentation process.                                                                                             | 0      | 2(8%)  | 5(19%) | 10(38%) | 9(35%) | 4.0  |
| 3. Developed two specific documentation skills.                                                                                       | 0      | 0      | 9(41%) | 8(36%)  | 5(23%) | 3.8  |
| 4. Developed skill in reducing and utilizing documentation data.                                                                      | 0      | 3(12%) | 8(32%) | 7(28%)  | 7(28%) | 3.7  |
| 5. Developed appropriate responses to the issues of reliability, validity, confidentiality, access and utilization.                   | 3(12%) | 4(17%) | 9(37%) | 4(17%)  | 4(17%) | 3.1  |

Table I  
Continued

| Objectives                                                  | -1    | 2     | 3      | 4       | 5+      | MEAN |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---------|------|
| 6. The goals/objectives of the program were clearly stated. | 1(4%) | 0     | 0      | 9(35%)  | 16(61%) | 4.5  |
| 7. The goals/objectives of the program were realizable.     | 1(4%) | 1(4%) | 3(12%) | 10(38%) | 11(42%) | 4.1  |

Participants felt that the conference objectives were clearly stated and realizable (items 6 and 7). However, the scores on items 3, 4, and 5 would indicate that there is some room for improvement, particularly in reducing and utilizing documentation data (item 4) and in responding to the issues of reliability, validity, confidentiality, access and utilization (item 5). Item 1, developing skill in planning for documentation that is responsive to program objectives, underlying theory and unexpected outcomes and item 2, experiencing the documentation process, had an above average rating and indicated participants' satisfaction.

#### Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (general)

Section B on Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (general) focused on the presenters and the conference organization. Table 2 contains the ratings.

TABLE 2  
Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (general)

| Evaluation Statements                                            | -1    | 2     | 3      | 4      | 5+      | MEAN |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|------|
| 1. Presenters were well-informed on their topic.                 | 2(7%) | 0     | 2(7%)  | 8(56%) | 15(56%) | 4.3  |
| 2. Presenters communicated effectively.                          | 2(8%) | 0     | 0      | 8(31%) | 16(61%) | 4.4  |
| 3. Adequate discussion time.                                     | 2(7%) | 1(4%) | 1(4%)  | 6(22%) | 17(63%) | 4.3  |
| 4. Organization of conference.                                   | 2(8%) | 1(4%) | 1(4%)  | 4(15%) | 18(69%) | 4.4  |
| 5. Conference format favorable.                                  | 0     | 2(8%) | 3(13%) | 4(17%) | 15(61%) | 4.3  |
| 6. Leaders and facilitators were effective.                      | 1(5%) | 0     | 3(12%) | 9(34%) | 13(50%) | 4.4  |
| 7. Leaders and facilitators were sensitive to participant needs. | 1(4%) | 0     | 2(8%)  | 6(23%) | 17(65%) | 4.6  |

Participants agreed that the conference leaders and facilitators were sensitive and responsive to their needs (item 7). In general, the participants seemed to feel positive about the organization of the conference and the quality of the presentations.

#### Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (specific)

In this session a separate rating for each workshop and each session was elicited. This information, it appeared, would provide useful data on the participants' reaction to the individual workshops.

TABLE 3  
Conference Relevancy/Effectiveness (specific)

| Evaluation Statements                                       | -1    | 2     | 3      | 4      | 5 +     | MEAN |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|------|
| 1. Team Planning for Documentation (Simulation and Reality) | 1(4%) | 0     | 6(25%) | 7(29%) | 10(42%) | 4.0  |
| 2. Experience in Data-Gathering Techniques.                 | 0     | 1(5%) | 4(19%) | 7(33%) | 9(43%)  | 4.1  |
| 3a. Skill Session (Recordkeeping)                           | 0     | 0     | 0      | 3(38%) | 5(62%)  | 4.6  |
| 3b. Skill Session (Media)                                   | 0     | 0     | 1(25%) | 0      | 3(75%)  | 4.5  |
| 3c. Skill Session (Psychometric A)                          | 0     | 0     | 0      | 4(44%) | 5(56%)  | 4.6  |
| 3d. Skill Session (Psychometric B)                          | 0     | 0     | 1(13%) | 4(50%) | 3(37%)  | 4.3  |
| 3e. Skill Session (Anthropological)                         | 0     | 0     | 0      | 3(30%) | 7(70%)  | 4.7  |
| 3f. Skill Session (Sociometric)                             | 0     | 1(8%) | 5(42%) | 2(17%) | 4(33%)  | 3.8  |
| 4. Compiling/Using Documentation                            | 0     | 1(5%) | 6(32%) | 7(37%) | 5(26%)  | 3.8  |
| 5. Introduction to National Conference Follow-Up            | 0     | 0     | 2(10%) | 9(45%) | 9(45%)  | 4.4  |
| 6. Planning Strand                                          | 0     | 0     | 1(7%)  | 4(27%) | 10(66%) | 4.6  |

Table 3  
continued

| Evaluation<br>Statements                 | -1 | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5 +    | MEAN |
|------------------------------------------|----|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 7. Institutionalization of Change Strand | 0  | 1(7%)  | 1(7%)  | 6(43%) | 6(43%) | 4.2  |
| 8. Documentation Strand                  | 0  | 0      | 0      | 2(25%) | 6(75%) | 4.8  |
| 9. Strand for 12 Cycle Projects          | 0  | 1(25%) | 0      | 0      | 3(75%) | 4.3  |
| 10. Team Meetings                        | 0  |        | 5(28%) | 6(33%) | 7(39%) | 4.1  |

The Documentation Strand was the most well-received of all the sessions at the conference. The Sociometric Workshop and the session on Compiling/Using Documentation were the least successful although these workshops still obtained above average ratings. The skill session on Anthropology was the most well attended, with ten (10) participants, and received the highest mean score (4.7) of that series. Of the follow-up strands, the Documentation Strand received the highest mean score (4.8) while the Planning Strand had the highest attendance with fifteen (15) participants.

#### Resources

The resource materials, the audio-visual equipment and the facilities are rated in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
Resources

| Evaluation Statements                      | -1     | 2      | 3      | 4       | 5+      | MEAN |
|--------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|------|
| 1. Printed Materials                       | 0      | 0      | 2(8%)  | 6(23%)  | 18(69%) | 4.6  |
| 2. Audio-Visual Equipment                  | 2(8%)  | 1(4%)  | 3(12%) | 11(44%) | 8(32%)  | 3.9  |
| 3. Conference Facilities and Meeting Space | 6(22%) | 3(12%) | 3(12%) | 7(27%)  | 7(27%)  | 3.2  |
| 4. Rooms and On-Site Services              | 2(8%)  | 5(20%) | 6(24%) | 1(4%)   | 11(44%) | 3.6  |

The mean score of 3.2 for conference facilities reflects the participants' discomfort with the heating system at the conference site. Because of the architectural design of the hotel, the heat did not warm either the lobby or meeting rooms.

On-site services also scored relatively low. This was due, in part, to the understaffing of the coffee shop and the high prices of the restaurant. The facility was quite isolated and, consequently, required transportation for any kind of outside exploration of eating establishments.

Participants seemed to feel good about the printed materials they received and not quite as content with the audio-visual equipment.

#### Personal Experience

Table 5 reflects the participants' experience of the conference both professionally and socially.

TABLE 5  
Personal Experience

| Evaluation Statements                                                        | -1    | 2 | 3      | 4      | 5 +     | MEAN |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---|--------|--------|---------|------|
| 1. Active involvement as a participant                                       | 1(4%) | 0 | 1(4%)  | 6(24%) | 17(68%) | 4.5  |
| 2. Application of learning to local project                                  | 1(4%) | 0 | 1(4%)  | 5(20%) | 18(72%) | 4.6  |
| 3. Individual hard work to achieve conference objectives                     | 1(4%) | 0 | 4(16%) | 6(24%) | 14(56%) | 4.3  |
| 4. Ample opportunity to meet formally and informally with other participants | 1(4%) | 0 | 0      | 8(32%) | 16(64%) | 4.5  |

Participants seemed to feel that their professional experience at the conference was positive. It is especially significant that they felt they could apply what they learned to their local project (item 2). While they were actively involved as participants (item 1), the score of 4.5 was not quite matched by item 3, individual hard work to achieve conference objectives. This statement received a mean score of 4.3.

### Recommendations for Future Conference Topics

Section G served as a needs assessment. Items 1 and 2 asked participants to indicate topics they would like to see covered in 1) a conference on the same subject and 2) a conference on other subjects. If they were to further explore documentation issues, participants would like:

- To examine specific areas of documentation (5);
- To participate in an informal sharing session (3);
- To explore how to involve local project personnel (2);
- To set aside time for individual problem-solving (1);
- To investigate innovative methods of collecting data (1); and
- To develop models of documentation (1).

In future conferences, on topics other than documentation, participants would like to examine:

- Multicultural education (3);
- Intra-inter project communication (3);
- Influencing Teacher Corps policy (2);
- Pupil-teacher effectiveness strategies (2);
- Institutionalization (1);
- School climate (1);
- Affective education (1);
- Curriculum revision (1);
- Individual projects' focus, methodology, products (1);
- Delivery of services (1);
- Political bridge-building (1);

- Community involvement (1);
- Role group assignments (1);
- Collaboration (1);
- Planning models for organizational change (1);
- Evaluation (1).
- Validation procedures (1).

There seems to be a considerable diversity of interests among Teacher Corps affiliated people. Participants seemed most interested in examining specific areas of documentation. Multicultural education was the most often requested of the non-documentation topics. Participating in an informal sharing session and intra-inter project communication are essentially the same request and were referred to in both the documentation and non-documentation section. This would indicate a strong desire on the part of project personnel to share with one another.

One participant stated that black consultants were underutilized and that more simulation gaming sessions should be incorporated into conferences.

### III. IMPLICATIONS

In general, the Workshop on Documentation and the National Conference Follow-Up Training Program was viewed by participants as a positive experience. The average rating for all program components combined was 4.2 on a five-point scale.

#### Summary Ranking and Recommendations

In this final ranking section, the participants had an opportunity to evaluate the conference in general and to make specific recommendations. Table 6 contains the summary rankings.

TABLE 6  
Summary Ranking

| Evaluation Statements           | -1 | 2      | 3      | 4       | 5+      | MEAN |
|---------------------------------|----|--------|--------|---------|---------|------|
| 1. Site Facilities              | 0  | 9(33%) | 8(30%) | 4(15%)  | 6(22%)  | 3.3  |
| 2. Instructors/<br>Facilitators | 0  | 0      | 1(4%)  | 10(42%) | 13(54%) | 3.7  |
| 3. Conference<br>Organization   | 0  | 0      | 2(8%)  | 8(32%)  | 15(60%) | 4.5  |
| 4. Objectives                   | 0  | 0      | 2(8%)  | 10(39%) | 14(53%) | 4.5  |
| 5. Materials                    | 0  | 0      | 1(4%)  | 11(44%) | 13(52%) | 4.5  |
| 6. Instructional<br>Strategies  | 0  | 0      | 4(17%) | 8(33%)  | 12(50%) | 4.3  |

Again, the facilities ranked the lowest as was true in Table 4, item 3. Comments in regard to the site suggest that the facility was too remote, too cold, and too expensive for meals. Several people expressed the desire for planned social events. A newcomer to Teacher Corps felt that there were some "closed" social activities and felt the sting of exclusion. A planned social event would, potentially, bring all participants together without distinction.

The objectives, when individually rated (Table 1, items 1-5), had an average score of 3.7. When the objectives were rated on the Summary Ranking (Table 6), the score was 4.5. The discrepancy could indicate that on an individual basis the objectives came less close to being met than when considered as a total. One individual commented that the objectives were too ambitious.

Conference Organization received a high rating (4.5) along with Instructional Strategies (4.3). Yet, Instructors/Facilitators ranked somewhat lower (3.7). These same facilitators seemed to fare much better when their skills were rated separately (Table 2). Materials in this section and in Table 4 scored approximately the same.

There is a noticeable discrepancy between some of the scores in the Summary Ranking Table and the tables where the items are ranked separately. This could indicate that:

- (a) the parts elicited a more accurate evaluation than the whole;

(b) the whole reflects a more accurate evaluation than the parts; (c) people see the whole differently than the parts; (d) the whole is not equal to the sum of its parts; (e) the truth is somewhere in between .

It is interesting to note that while participants had an opportunity to make recommendations in this section, there were only sixteen (16) written responses out of a possible ninety-six (96).

Although this particular evaluation provided the Network with some important information on the conference, there are some flaws in the format. For example, the construction of items 1 and 3 in Table 5. Item 1 asks participants to evaluate their level of involvement and item 3 asks participants to evaluate how hard they worked to achieve the conference objectives. It seems possible that people might consider, even unconsciously, answering high on the scale if only to represent a positive self-image for her/his own benefit. Thus, a truly reflective response would be inadvertently discouraged. While the issues represented are important, there may be more effective ways of obtaining the desired answers.

The evaluation might also have reflected a more accurate response if it were given throughout the conference so that peoples' immediate reactions could have been recorded. This approach also would have given early departers an opportunity to react to those sessions they attended.

The Documentation Strand of the National Conference Follow-Up Program received the highest mean score. This is especially noteworthy since documentation was the focus of the first part of the conference. This might reflect the continued desire on the part of documenters to define and examine their role.

Clearly, the issue of documentation has come more into focus as project documenters begin to explore and discover the diversity, complexity and creativity that is inherent in their position. While documenters can, individually, investigate and tap their talents, the conference setting permits an opportunity for the exchange of ideas, the sharing of information, and the enhancement of skills. Because documentation for Teacher Corps seems to fit somewhere between an art, a skill and a discipline, this is all the more reason to believe that further training will uncover additional resources and provide documenters with a renewed sense of direction.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A  
CONFERENCE PROGRAM

# CONFERENCE PROGRAM

## Monday February 12, 1979

|             |                              |             |                                                                                      |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2:00 - 2:30 | Registration                 | 3:00 - 6:30 | Team Planning for<br>Documentation<br>(Simulation and Reality)<br>Dr. Roberta Hughey |
| 2:30 - 3:00 | Overview<br>Dr. Edith Miller |             |                                                                                      |

## Tuesday February 13, 1979

|             |                                                                       |                             |                                                                                   |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8:30 - 9:30 | Experience in Data-Gathering<br>Dr. Suzanne Kinzer<br>Ms. Kristy Wray | Session V<br><br>Session VI | Anthropological<br>Dr. Mike Littleford<br>Sociometric<br>Dr. Charles Greenshields |
| 9:30 - 9:45 | Introduction (Skill Sessions A)<br>Dr. Edith Miller                   |                             |                                                                                   |

|              |                                                         |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 9:45 - 10:15 | Team Choice of Participants to<br>Attend Skill Sessions |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------|

EACH SESSION WILL BE REPEATED.

## BREAK 10:15 - 10:30

10:30 - 12:00

## CONCURRENT SKILL SESSIONS A

|             |                                     |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Session I   | Recordkeeping -- Dr. Roberta Hughey |
| Session II  | Media -- Dr. Ron Wright             |
| Session III | Psychometric A -- Dr. Robert Soar   |
| Session IV  | Psychometric B -- Mr. Ron Springer  |

LUNCH 12:00 - 1:30

1:30 - 3:15 Continuation of Skill Sessions A

BREAK 3:15 - 3:30

3:30 - 3:45 Introduction (Skill Sessions B)  
Ms. Kristy Wray

3:45 - 5:15 Concurrent Skill Sessions B

Wednesday February 14, 1979

8:30 - 10:15

Continuation of Skill Sessions B

Session I

Planning Strand  
Dr. Walt Le Baron  
Mr. Bruce Dollar

BREAK 10:15 - 10:30

10:30 - 12:00

Compiling/Using Documentation  
Dr. Roberta Hughey  
Dr. Edith Miller  
Dr. Johnnie Mills

Session II

Institutionalization  
of Change Strand  
Dr. Roger Pankratz  
Dr. Ann Wheeler

LUNCH 12:00 - 1:30

1:30 - 2:30

Introduction to National  
Conference Follow-Up  
Dr. Roger Pankratz

Session III

Documentation Strand  
Dr. Roberta Hughey  
Dr. Edith Miller

2:30 - 5:30

National Conference Follow-Up  
Concurrent Strand Sessions

Session IV

Strand for Twelve  
Cycle Projects  
Dr. Roger Pankratz  
Dr. Ann Wheeler

Thursday February 15, 1979

|               |                                 |
|---------------|---------------------------------|
| 8:30 - 10:30  | Continuation of Strand Sessions |
| 10:30 - 12:00 | Team Meetings                   |
| 12:00 - 12:30 | Evaluation                      |

**APPENDIX B**  
**CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM**

# PARTICIPANT CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Role Group \_\_\_\_\_

So that we continually improve the quality of Network programming, we would appreciate your candid feedback on this evaluation. Please circle the number that indicates the degree to which you feel the objectives were met with 1 being the MOST NEGATIVE indicator and 5 being the MOST POSITIVE indicator.

## A. OBJECTIVES

- |                                                                                                                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Developed skill in planning for documentation that is responsive to program objectives, underlying theory and unexpected outcomes. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Experienced the documentation process.                                                                                             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Developed <u>two</u> specific documentation skills.                                                                                | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Developed skill in reducing and utilizing documentation data.                                                                      | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Developed appropriate responses to the issues of reliability, validity, confidentiality, access and utilization.                   | 1 2 3 4 5 |

- 
- |                                                             |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 6. The goals/objectives of the program were clearly stated. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. The goals/objectives of the program were realizable.     | 1 2 3 4 5 |

## B. CONFERENCE RELEVANCY/EFFECTIVENESS (General)

Please circle the number that indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below with 1 being the MOST NEGATIVE indicator and 5 being the MOST POSITIVE indicator.

- |                                                                                            |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Presenters were well-informed and had current information on their topic.               | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Presenters communicated their material effectively.                                     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. There was adequate time for discussion following presentations.                         | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. The conference was well-organized.                                                      | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. The format of the conference added favorably to the program effectiveness.              | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Conference leaders and facilitators effectively assisted my learning experience.        | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Conference leaders and facilitators were sensitive and responsive to participant needs. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

## C. CONFERENCE RELEVANCY/EFFECTIVENESS (Specific)

Please circle the number that indicates the effectiveness of these conference sessions with 1 being the LEAST EFFECTIVE indicator and 5 being the MOST EFFECTIVE indicator. Under Skill Sessions and Strand Sessions rate only the workshops you attended.

- |                                                             |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Team Planning for Documentation (Simulation and Reality) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Experience in Data-Gathering                             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Skill Sessions                                           |           |
| Recordkeeping                                               | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Media                                                       | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Psychometric A                                              | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Psychometric B                                              | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Anthropological                                             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Sociometric                                                 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Compiling/Using Documentation                            | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Introduction to National Conference Follow-Up            | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Planning Strand                                          | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Institutionalization of Change Strand                    | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Documentation Strand                                     | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Strand for 12 Cycle Projects                             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Team Meetings                                           | 1 2 3 4 5 |

## D. RESOURCES

Please circle the number that most indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below with 1 being the MOST NEGATIVE indicator and 5 being the MOST POSITIVE indicator.

- |                                                                                                            |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. The printed materials received during the conference were relevant, useful, and clearly written.        | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. The use of audio-visual equipment and other support materials was adequate and effective.               | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. The conference facilities and meeting space were comfortable, well-furnished and conducive to learning. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Rooms and on-site services were adequate for my needs.                                                  | 1 2 3 4 5 |

## E. PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

Please circle the number that indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below with 1 being the MOST NEGATIVE indicator and 5 being the MOST POSITIVE indicator.

- |                                                                                    |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. I was actively involved as a participant.                                       | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. I can apply what I learned to my local project.                                 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. I worked hard to achieve the conference objectives.                             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. I had ample opportunity to meet informally or socially with other participants. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

## F. SUMMARY RANKING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Rank the following areas according to degree of success with 1 being the LEAST SUCCESSFUL and 5 being the MOST SUCCESSFUL. If you rank 2 or below, what are your recommendations for improvement?

- |                             |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Site/Facilities          | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Instructors/Facilitators | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Conference Organization  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Objectives               | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Materials                | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Instructional Strategies | 1 2 3 4 5 |

If you were to attend a conference on the same topic again, what issues or topics would you like to have covered in the program?

If you were to attend another Network conference on a different topic, what topics would you like to have covered?

APPENDIX C  
NETWORK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NETWORK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Dr. Mae Christian

Dr. Willie Epps

Dr. Howard Fortney

Dr. U. Eugene George

Dr. John Hansen

Dr. Amos Issac

Dr. John Kampsnyder

Dr. Suzanne Kinzer

Dr. Yvonne Luster

Dr. Edith Miller

Dr. Mark Richmond

Dr. Robert Scott

Dr. Marcy Szymanski

Dr. Elmer Tossie

APPENDIX D  
COUNCIL OF DEANS

COUNCIL OF DEANS

Dr. Milton Baxter  
Dr. Jack Blackburn  
Dr. Nathaniel Bocclair  
Dr. Huey Charlton  
Dr. B. E. Fancher  
Dr. Jack Gant  
Dr. Leon Lessinger  
Dr. Evelyn Martin  
Dr. Joseph Martin  
Dr. William C. Moran  
Dr. Andrew A. Robinson  
Dr. Wayman Shiver, Jr.  
Dr. David Smith  
Dr. G. W. Sowards  
Dr. Billy Williams

APPENDIX E  
TEACHER CORPS WASHINGTON  
STAFF CONTACT PERSONS

DR. WILLIAM SMITH, DIRECTOR  
NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS PROJECT

MS. DIANE YOUNG, PROGRAM SPECIALIST  
SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

APPENDIX F  
TASK FORCE PLANNING TEAM

TASK FORCE PLANNING TEAM  
for  
A WORKSHOP ON PLANNING FOR DOCUMENTATION  
AND  
THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP TRAINING  
PROGRAM

Dr. Burnett Joiner  
Dr. Suzanne Kinzer  
Dr. Edith Miller  
Dr. Marcy Szymanski

APPENDIX G  
LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

List of Participants

A Workshop on Planning for Documentation  
and  
The National Conference Follow-Up Training Program  
February 12-15, 1979

PROJECT

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Mae Christian  
Atlanta Consortium  
2930 Forrest Hill Dr., S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Dr. Chuck Fuller  
Mr. Robert Harris

Dr. Willie Epps  
Teacher Corps  
Mississippi Valley State University  
Department of Elementary Education  
Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941

Dr. Willie Epps  
Mr. Percy Washington  
Mr. Ed King  
Dr. Dorothy Leflore  
Ms. Claudine McGee

Dr. Howard Fortney  
Teacher Corps  
P. O. Box 247  
Eastaboga, Alabama 36260

Dr. Howard Fortney  
Dr. Erby Fisher  
Mr. Bill Parrish

Dr. U. Eugene George  
Teacher Corps  
College of Education  
University of South Carolina  
503 South Main Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dr. U. Eugene George  
Dr. Nancy Hill  
Dr. Loretta McIntosh

Dr. John Hansen  
Teacher Corps  
Florida State University  
403 Education Building  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. Bill Castine  
Mr. Zack Wuthrick  
Ms. Iris Yetter

Dr. Amos Issac  
Teacher Corps  
Miles College  
Birmingham, Alabama 35208

Dr. Amos Issac  
Ms. Mary Jackson  
Ms. Florence Harris  
Ms. Marquita Holey  
Ms. Mildred Mann

PROJECT

Dr. Suzanne Kinzer  
Teacher Corps  
College of Education  
University of Florida  
293 Norman Hall  
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. Yvonne Luster  
Teacher Corps  
School of Education  
Alcorn State University  
Lorman, Miss. 39096

Dr. Edith Miller  
Teacher Corps  
Auburn University  
4032 Haley Center  
Auburn, Ala. 36830

Dr. Mark Richmond  
Teacher Corps  
University of Southern Mississippi  
Southern Station Box 10005  
Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401

Dr. Robert Scott  
Teacher Corps  
P. O. Drawer 829  
Florence, S. C. 29503

Dr. Marcy Szymanski  
Teacher Corps  
University of West Florida  
Pensacola, Fla. 32504

Dr. Elmer R. Tossie  
Hastings Teacher Corps  
P. O. Box 487  
Hastings, Fla. 32045

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Suzanne Kinzer  
Ms. Kristy Wray  
Dr. Roberta Hughey

Dr. Yvonne Luster  
Dr. Fred Harris  
Dr. Joseph Martin  
Mrs. Doris Caldwell

Dr. Edith Miller  
Dr. John von Eschenbach  
Mr. Jennifer Nichols  
Ms. Katherine Collins  
Ms. Erma Walton

Ms. Eleanor Williams  
Ms. Gwen Porter

Dr. Robert Scott  
Dr. Nick Nicholson  
Mr. Jerry Hough

Ms. Norma French  
Ms. Terry Young

Dr. Elmer Tossie  
Dr. David Mosrie

CONSULTANTS

Mr. Bruce Dollar  
Dr. Roberta Hughey  
Dr. Charles Greenshields  
Dr. Suzanne Kinzer  
Dr. Walt Le Baron  
Dr. Mike Littleford  
Dr. Edith Miller  
Dr. Johnnie Mills  
Dr. Roger Pankratz  
Mr. Ron Springer  
Dr. Robert Soar  
Dr. Ann Wheeler  
Dr. Ron Wright  
Ms. Kristy Wray